

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 1, 2007. Claims 12 to 15, 27 to 30, 38 to 41 and 43 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 12, 27, 38 and 43 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment accorded Applicant's undersigned representative during the February 12, 2008 telephonic interview. This Amendment has been prepared based on the discussions and agreements reached during that interview and it is respectfully submitted that this Amendment summarizes those discussions and agreements.

In the Office Action, Claims 12, 27, 38 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments to the claims addresses the antecedence points noted in the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In addition, Claims 12, 14, 27, 29, 38, 40 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,622,266 (Goddard) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0044828 (Kikinis), and Claim 13, 28 and 39 were rejected under § 103(a) over Goddard in view of Kikinis and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,97 (Fowler). Claims 15, 30 and 41 were rejected under § 103(a) for similar reasons as Claims 12 to 14, although the precise grounds of the rejection is not entirely clear. However, in addressing the rejections, Applicant presumes that Claims 15, 30 and 41 are rejected over Goddard in view of Kikinis. Nonetheless, clarification of the grounds of rejection for these claims is respectfully requested.

As discussed during the interview, the present invention as recited in independent Claims 12, 27, 38 and 43 is characterized in that (i) a registration unit (step) registers reply information indicating plural reply destinations, respectively corresponding to plural statuses of a device, and (ii) an electronic mail transmitted by an electronic mail transmission unit (step) includes transmission data that has reply information indicating a reply destination, which is determined based on obtained status information of the device.

In more detail, the invention registers reply destination information for a plurality of reply destinations, each corresponding to a particular type of status of a device. That is, for each of a plurality of statuses of a device, a corresponding reply destination is registered so that a user receiving an email that includes the reply destination can then answer the email to that particular destination. In the invention, transmission data is generated according to a message obtained based on an obtained status of the device, destination information for the transmission data, and reply destination information which is determined based on the obtained status. An electronic mail message is then sent to the destination, where the mail message includes the reply destination information and the obtained message. An example of a received email notification is shown in Fig. 10. In this regard, we note that Figs. 10 and 11 should be amended so that “REPLAY-TO” reads “REPLY-TO”, and we will attend to this when we file the response.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 12 is directed to a data transfer processing apparatus which controls data transfer in a device, comprising a registration unit that registers reply destination information indicating each of a plurality of reply destinations, the plurality of reply destinations being different from each other and corresponding to a respective plurality of statuses of the device, wherein the

reply destination information refers to an address to which an answer is transmitted in response to an electronic mail, a status obtaining unit that obtains status information about one of the plurality of statuses of the device, a message obtaining unit that obtains a message according to the status information obtained by the status obtaining unit, a transmission data generation unit that generates transmission data according to the message obtained by the message obtaining unit, according to destination information indicating a destination address to which the transmission data is transmitted, and according to the reply destination information indicating one of the plurality of reply destinations, which is determined based on the status information obtained by the status obtaining unit, wherein the generated transmission data includes the destination information and the reply destination information indicating one of the plurality of reply destinations, which is determined based on the status information obtained by the status obtaining unit, the reply destination indicated by the reply destination information being a destination for a reply to an electronic mail; and an electronic mail transmission unit that transmits as electronic mail the transmission data generated by the transmission data generation unit.

Claims 27, 38 and 43 substantially correspond to Claim 11.

The applied art of Goddard and Kikinis is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 11, 27, 38 and 43, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of generating transmission data according to an obtained message, according to destination information indicating a destination address to which the transmission data is transmitted, and according to reply destination information indicating one of a plurality of reply destinations, which is determined based on obtained status

information of a device, wherein the generated transmission data includes the destination information and the reply destination information indicating one of the plurality of reply destinations, which is determined based on the status information obtained by the status obtaining unit/step, the reply destination indicated by the reply destination information being a destination for a reply to an electronic mail.

Goddard is seen to disclose that an alert (e-mail) is transmitted to an appropriate recipient according to an alert type by previously designating e-mail addresses which are respectively different from one another according to various alert conditions. That is, Goddard, while in some ways being similar to the invention in that it generates an e-mail message to provide an alert notification of an error in a printing device, is nonetheless different from the invention. Specifically, the e-mail message of Goddard does not include reply destination information in the sense of the invention in which the reply destination information is included in the e-mail so that a recipient of the e-mail alert will then be able to utilize the reply destination in order to obtain information about the error, including information on who to contact to have the error attended to, or information on how to correct the error. The Office Action admits to this shortcoming of Goddard, and during the interview, the Examiner tended to confirm this shortcoming of Goddard.

Kikinis is seen to disclose that information such as "from" or "reply-to" is automatically inserted as a reply e-mail into an original e-mail sent from a customer to a center. That is, in Kikinis, a customer submits an e-mail message to a customer service representative inquiring about a problem that they are experiencing. The customer service representative scans the e-mail inquiry for particular words or phrases in order to automatically determine what problem the customer is experiencing. The customer service

representative then responds to the customer inquiry with an e-mail that includes a reply-to address for the customer to send then send their inquiry to the appropriate department for resolution. Thus, while Kikinis may include a reply destination in an e-mail, it is included in a reply e-mail and not an original e-mail that is generated based on the obtained status of a device. Additionally, while the reply destination may be related to the customer's inquiry, it is not seen to correspond to the obtained status of the device in the context of the claims. Therefore, the claimed invention is believed to be allowable over the proposed combination of Goddard and Kikinis.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Claims 11, 27, 38 and 43, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200